

REMARKS

The applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephonic interview conducted on November 17, 2004. In the interview the prior art, invention and possible claim language were discussed.

The application now includes claims 1-50. Claims 1, 24 and 28 are independent claims. Claims 1, 4-5, 10, 12-16, 18, 20-21 and 23-46 have been amended. Claims 47-50 have been added herewith.

Claims 1-3, 5-12, 17-20 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Rabne et al 6,006,332.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rabne further in view of Chaddha et al 5,621,660.

Claims 13-16, 24-29, 31-34 and 37-46 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rabne, further in view of Tso et al 6,185,625.

Claims 21 and 35-36 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rabne, further in view of Gerace 5,991,735.

Claims 30 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rabne in view of Tso et al and further in view of Chaddha.

The Applicant's response refers primarily to the independent claims rejected by the Examiner. The patentability of the dependent claims will follow at least for the reason of being dependent on an independent claim, which is patentable.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 24 and 28 to clarify the invention as discussed in the telephonic interview. The dependent claims were amended to conform to the amended independent claims. New claim 47 adds a limitation removed from claim 28 in this amendment.

Claim 1 has been amended as follows.

First, the claim has been amended to explicitly state what was previously implicit, that access to the data source is limited.

Second, the claim has been amended to clarify that the server is a proxy server. As also expanded upon in dependent claims, this allows few or no changes to be required from the server or client, making installation simpler. This issue is discussed in the application, for example: page 14 lines 5-11.

Third, the term "modify" has been used instead of the term "encode", this emphasizes the previously claimed feature that the modification makes the information less available to copying. Further clarified is that the modified information is still accessible for a human when displayed. A

particular example is to show a graphic screen in two or more parts that are displayed intermittently at a speed high enough to be unnoticed by the human eye but complicates the ability of a user to copy the screen. This issue is discussed in the application, for example: page 21 lines 13-34, page 22 lines 1-26.

Fourth, displaying does not require software of the type which requires user intervention. Typically a standard web browser will not permit installation of an external executable software unless a user gives consent, for security reasons. This scares users. This issue is discussed in the application, for example: page 19 lines 24-30, page 20 lines 19-25. In some embodiments, a java applet is used for displaying the information.

Amendments to the other claims will be discussed below.

With regard to the art rejections. Claim 1 is distinguished over Rabne at least by the modification of information to make the information less available for copying while still being accessible to a human when displayed. In addition, claim 1 includes a proxy server. In addition, claim 1 includes the limitation regarding not requiring user intervention for software. Rabne does not meet any of these limitations. On the contrary and as will be explained below, Rabne also teaches away from these limitations. Rabne describes a complete system for supplying copy protected content (e.g. Abstract). Rabne's system encrypts the content at a data server and sends it to a client (e.g. col. 15 lines 14-19). The client downloads a launch pad program that is installed in the client browser and authenticates the user (e.g. col. 6 line 61-col. 7 line 4). The launch pad program downloads necessary browser software to decrypt content and display it to the user (e.g. col. 6 line 53-col. 7 line 4). Rabne would consider modifying the information unnecessary and possibly counter productive, as full quality information was paid for and any modification might be objected to. In any case, Rabne would consider the encryption sufficient for preventing copying, noting the Rabne's software actively controls the user's station to prevent copying (column 18, lines 12-19). Further, providing a proxy would possibly interfere with authentication and add apparently unnecessary complexity. Furthermore, Rabne's insists on using an installed executable program at the client to control the process, possibly to ensure authorization. There is no hint in Rabne that this executable could be omitted in a working system.

With regard to Tso, applicant respectfully submits that modifying the information as in Tso is not required nor would it be practiced in the system of Rabne, for the reasons described above. In particular, Tso is directed to a service for allowing scaling of images while allowing a user full access not only to the original image but also to the modifications this would defeat the purpose of Rabne which is access management and limitation.

Without going into detail of the other cited art, applicant respectfully submits that as Rabne is a complete system which provided full control, there would not be any motivation to further complicate it as suggested by the Examiner. Of course, the amendments and/or arguments above show that Rabne does not provide a prima facie case of obviousness and none of the cited art completes the missing limitations.

New claims 48-50 add the limitation that the information is not encrypted, in distinct contrast to Rabne, where encryption is a requirement.

Additionally, the applicant would like to point out that some of the limitations in the dependent claims are clearly not shown by any of the art introduced by the Examiner, for example:

1. "information that is temporally modulated on the client display in a manner which hinders copying" (claim 4 and 30).

2. "said encoding converts at least part of one static object to a dynamic object" (claim 21 and 35).

3. "encoding at said proxy comprises inserting advertisements into said displayed data" (claim 36).

Claim 24 has been amended in a manner similar to claim 1, where applicable and clarified.

Claim 28 has been amended in a manner similar to claim 1, where applicable and clarified.

Claim 28 has also been broadened by removal of a limitation.

Applicants note that the term "modified" on its own is boarder than the term "encoded" which it replaces, albeit clearer when referring to display.

Briefly referring to the amendments in the dependent claims. Claim 4 is amended for clarity and to confirm to the amendments of claim 1. The dependency of claim 5 was changed. Claim 12 is amended to explicitly discuss encoding. Claim 13 and 14 are made dependent on claim 1 and refer to converting. Claims 15, 16, 18, 20, 21 and 23 were amended to conform to the amendments of claim 1.

Claims 25-27 were amended to conform to the amendments of claim 24.

Claims 29 was amended to conform to the amendments of 28. Claim 30 was amended to conform to the amendments of 28 and for clarity. Claims 31- 38 were amended to conform to the amendments of claim 28. Claims 39-46 were amended to conform to changes in claims 28 and/or 38.

In view of the above explanations and amendments applicant sees the Examiner's rejections as moot. An allowance of all the claims is respectfully awaited.

018/02357 A03

If the Examiner is unable to agree that the claims are all patentable, he is respectfully requested to contact Maier Fenster at toll free 1 (877) 428-5468. This number connects directly to our office in Israel. Please note that Israel is 7 hours ahead of Washington and that our work week is Sunday-Thursday.

Respectfully submitted,
E. MARMOR



Maier Fenster
Reg. No. 41,016

November 18, 2004
William H. Dippert, Esq.
Reed Smith LLP
599 Lexington Avenue, 29th Floor
New York, NY 10022-7650